

REMARKS

Objection was made to the format of the corrections made to claims 3-5. Applicants list these previously presented claims with the appropriate underlinings and strikethroughs that were missing in the previous paper. The claims are in proper form for consideration.

Claims 1, 6, 10, 14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kunkel et al. Applicants' invention as now set forth in these claims involves taking successive images from a browser application and capturing, compressing and delivering those successive images as a television channel to a plurality of subscriber televisions. Thus, a subscriber television can tune to such a channel in order to view a slide show of successive web page images. Such a system is neither disclosed, suggested nor contemplated by Kunkel.

Kunkel does not seek to provide a variety of web page channels to a plurality of subscriber televisions. Rather, Kunkel describes an interactive access method. Individuals can interact with a browser application at the headend. A user may select a web page which is then sent from the headend to the user over a vertical blanking interval or the like. There is no suggestion that the individual's interaction with the interactive system will provide programming to other subscribers. Rather this is an individual interactive session for a single user. Other users may likewise interact and have their own individual sessions. There is no suggestion in any way contemplating the web page television channels as taught and claimed by applicants.

Claim 10, for example, recites "delivering the succession of images compressed in the compressing act to the plurality of subscriber televisions as a corresponding television channel." Kunkel, on the other hand, provides interactive sessions with individual settop boxes. A web page being sent down stream by Kunkel is provided with a session ID for identifying the session ID of the intended receiving settop converter box for the payload. (col. 9, lines 62-65) Kunkel sends individually addressed data streams. The sessions of Kunkel are individual. A session manager connects a user to one of the available active browsers to conduct an interactive session. (col. 13, lines 10-14) Providing a succession of images on a corresponding television channel to a plurality of subscriber televisions is not even hinted at by Kunkel et al. Such a television channel is


not suggested or disclosed by Kunkel. For these reasons, Applicants submit that the finality of the rejection is premature and that the claims are allowable over Kunkel.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kunkel in view of Bates. Bates, however, merely discloses a computer system. Bates makes absolutely no mention of television and thus fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Kunkel with regard to failing to support or disclose a successive web page television channel to a plurality of subscribers. Therefore, these claims are allowable over the cited art.

Claims 4, 9, 13 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kunkel in view of Bates and further in view Seazholtz. There has been no suggestion that Seazholtz satisfies the deficiencies of Kunkel. Therefore these claims should be allowed.

For the foregoing reasons, the finality of the rejection is premature and should be retracted. All claims pending in the application are believed allowable over the art of record and early notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. Asher
Reg. No. 30,445
Bromberg & Sunstein LLP
125 Summer Street, 11th Floor
Boston, MA 02110-1618
(617) 443-9292
Attorney for Applicants